

Claims 1-12 are presented for examination, of which Claims 1 and 7 are in independent form. Claims 13-18 have been withdrawn from consideration. Favorable reconsideration is requested.

Claims 1-12 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent 6,311,011 to Kuroda¹. After a careful study of the prior art and the Office Action, Applicant finds himself unable to agree with the propriety of the outstanding rejections, for at least the following reasons.

Claim 1 is directed to a television signal receiver connected to multiple recording apparatuses that record program data. The television signal receiver includes an input unit to receive the program data, an identification unit adapted to identify the appropriate group for which the program data belongs, a selection unit adapted to select the appropriate recording apparatus from the plurality of apparatuses based on the identified group, and an output unit to output the program data to the selected recording apparatus.

A notable feature of this receiver is selecting an appropriate recording apparatus from a plurality of recording apparatuses based on an identified appropriate group to which the program data belongs. By virtue of the claimed features, the group could be, for example, a genre. Kuroda fails to teach or suggest this feature

Kuroda, as understood by Applicant, relates to a device for recording video signals and a device for displaying an electronic program guide. At page 3 of the Office Action, the Examiner states regarding Kuroda: "A selection unit to select a recording apparatuses from a

¹ Applicant notes that Kuroda is prior art only under Section 102(e).

plurality of recording apparatuses is shown in fig.3 where the user can select a storage device and based on the capacity of the device the program will be recorded to that device or be directed to another device (col. 5 ll.25-67)".

First, in Kuroda, *the viewer* selects one of the storage devices (see column 5, lines 26-34, and Fig. 5). On the contrary, in Claim 1 the *selection unit* selects the appropriate recording apparatus based on identified properties of program data.

Second, the cited portion of Kuroda does not teach or suggest selecting an appropriate recording apparatus from a plurality of recording apparatuses *based on an identified appropriate group to which the program data belongs*, as recited in Claim 1.

Even if Kuroda is deemed to teach all it is cited for by the Examiner, at most Kuroda would merely discuss selecting a storage device *by a viewer*, and *based on the capacity of the device* recording a program to that device, or to another device if the user so desires. (See col. 5, lines 25-67, of that patent.) In fact, the Office Action does not even acknowledge that Claim 1 recites selecting a recording apparatus *in accordance with a group identified by the identification unit*.

In particular, in Kuroda, at STEP S104 of Fig. 3 a capacity for storing contents is calculated. The video recorder/player compares the calculated capacity at STEP S104 with the remaining capacity of the storage device selected by the user at STEP S106 (STEP S107). If the remaining capacity is larger than the calculated one, then STEP S108 follows, and the video recorder/player starts recording to the selected storage. If the remaining capacity is not larger than the calculated one, STEP S111 follows, and a dialog of Fig. 6 warns that the storage device

selected at STEP S106 does not have sufficient capacity for recording the contents and allows the viewer a choice to select another storage device or to record the storage device selected at STEP S106 (STEP S111).

Nothing in *Kuroda* teaches or suggests selecting an appropriate recording apparatus from a plurality of recording apparatuses based on an identified appropriate group to which the program data belongs, as recited in Claim 1.

For all these reasons, Applicant strongly urges that Claim 1 is clearly allowable over Kuroda.

Independent Claim 7 is a method claim corresponding to apparatus Claim 1, and is believed also to be allowable for the reasons discussed above in connection with Claim 1.


A review of the other art of record has failed to reveal anything which, in Applicant's opinion, would remedy the deficiencies of the art discussed above, as a reference against the independent claims herein. Those claims are therefore believed patentable over the art of record.

The other rejected claims in this application depend from one or another of the independent claims discussed above and, therefore, are submitted to be patentable for at least the same reasons. Since each dependent claim is also deemed to define an additional aspect of the invention, individual reconsideration of the patentability of each claim on its own merits is respectfully requested.

In view of the foregoing remarks, Applicant respectfully requests favorable reconsideration and early passage to issue of the present application.

Applicant's undersigned attorney may be reached in our New York Office by telephone at (212) 218-2100. All correspondence should continue to be directed to our address listed below.

Respectfully submitted,

A handwritten signature in cursive script, appearing to read "Leonard P. Diana", written over a horizontal line.

Leonard P. Diana
Attorney for Applicant
Registration No. 29,296

FITZPATRICK, CELLA, HARPER & SCINTO
30 Rockefeller Plaza
New York, New York 10112-3801
Facsimile: (212) 218-2200

NY_MAIN 497612v1